arXiv:1605.02458v2 [quant-ph] 4 Aug 2016

Broadcasting Quantum Coherence via Cloning

Indranil Chakrabarty, Udit Kamal Sharma[1] and Manish Kumar Shukla[2]

[1]*Center for Security, Theory and Algorithmic Research, International Institute of Information Technology, Gachibowli, Hyderabad, India*

[2]*Center for Computational Natural Sciences and Bioinformatics, International Institute of Information Technology, Gachibowli, Hyderabad, India*

Quantum coherence (QCh) is considered to be a key ingredient in quantum resource theories and also plays a pivotal role in the design and implementation of various information processing tasks. Consequently, it becomes important for us to create more number coherent quantum states between two labs from a given coherent state shared initially. We call this process as **Broadcasting of Quantum Coherence (QCh)**. In this work we extensively study the problem of broadcasting of QCh. In order to have a holistic view of broadcasting, we start with a most general representation two qubit mixed state in terms of Bloch vectors. As a cloning transformation we have used universal symmetric optimal Buzek-Hillery (BH) cloner locally as well as non locally. Remarkably, we find that in either of the case it is impossible to do optimal broadcasting of QCh. Further we show in case of non optimal broadcasting it is impossible to increase QCh of the state by both local and non local cloning operations. In non optimal case, apart from general result we consider examples like, a) Werner like states (WLS) and b) Bell diagonal states (BDS) and obtain ranges for broadcasting in terms of input state parameters.

PACS numbers:

INTRODUCTION

Quantum coherence (QCh) plays an important role in today's physics, more specifically in physics of low temperature starting from the laws of thermodynamics [1] and most recently in the emerging area of quantum information theory. It has been useful in understanding the underlying process of efficient energy transfer in complex biological systems [2]. In the recent past researchers have attempted to devolop a framework to formalize the theory of QCh within the realms of quantum information theory and quantum resource theories [3]. In this framework QCh is quantified in terms of the functions of coherence monotones. Some of these better known measures are based on l_1 norm, relative entropy [4], skew information [5] and there are many others [6]. Several works were done in this context to extend the measures of coherence for multipartite systems[7]. In another work, researchers studied the creation of QCh using unitary operations with limited thermodynamic resources and eventually they found explicitly the unitary transformation that creates the maximal coherence [8]. Other works were done where people found the average relative entropy of coherence of pure quantum states sampled randomly from the uniform Haar measure and showed that it to be typical [9]. It was shown that in the asymptotic limit, the minimum amount of noise that is required to fully decohere a quantum system, is equal to the relative entropy of coherence. This is quantified by the cost of erasing QCh [10]. In another work it was demonstrated that measurements in a coherent basis are needed to make use of coherence, and that such measurements must be generated by coherent unitary interactions with an environment [11]. Recently some authors derive complementarity relations between coherence measures on mutually unbiased bases using various coherence measures [13]. In a similar kind of work the robustness of coherence was suitably defined and was proven a full monotone in the context of the recently introduced resource theories of QCh [12]. Another group of authors showed that all measures of coherence are frozen for an initial state in a strictly incoherent channel if and only if the relative entropy of coherence is frozen for the state [14]. Further work show the study the relation between QCh and quantum discord, a kind of quantum correlation which appears even in non entangled states [15]. A new framework for measuring QCh in finite dimensional systems was introduced and a theoretical measure satisfying the reliability criteria was established in the context of quantum resource theories [5].

The impossibility to clone quantum states is regarded as one of the most fundamental restriction that comes from nature [16]. The "No cloning theorem" states that there exists no quantum mechanical process, which can take two distinct non-orthogonal quantum states $|\psi\rangle$, $|\phi\rangle$ into states $|\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$, $|\phi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle$ respectively. Even though we cannot copy an unknown quantum state perfectly but quantum mechanics never rules out the possibility of cloning it approximately [16–24]. It also allows probabilistic cloning as one can always clone an arbitrary quantum state perfectly with some non-zero probability of succsess [24, 25]. In the year 1996, Buzek et al. went beyond the idea of perfect cloning and introduced the concept of approximate cloning . In this process, they have also introduced the state independent quantum copying machine by keeping the fidelity of

cloning independent of the input state parameters. This machine is also popularly known as universal quantum cloning machine (UQCM) [17]. Later in another work by Gisin and Massar this cloner was shown to be optimal [18, 26]. Other than this state independent quantum cloning machine (QCM), there are also state dependent QCMs [18, 24, 27]. State dependent quantum cloning machine can be both dynamic and static depending on the choice of machine parameters [28]. In this context it was shown that how the fidelity of quantum cloning machine is related with the amount of correlation generated in the process of cloning [29].

Quantum entanglement [30] in general quantum correlation is considered as a useful resource as it plays a significant role in computational and communication processes like quantum key generation [31, 32], secret sharing [33], teleportation [34], superdense coding [35], entanglement swapping [36, 37], remote entanglement distribution [38] and in many more tasks [39]. The more "pure" is entanglement, more "valuable" is the given two-particle state at least from the point of view of information processing tasks. Therefore it becomes important to extract pure entanglement from mixed entangled state. Researchers had done a lot of work in past years on these extraction processes [40]. This comes at the cost of reduction of number of entangled states. It is interesting to see that in quantum information processing scenario, there exists tasks which are completely opposite to this from the operational point of view. This comes under the umbrella of "Broadcasting of inseparability" [27, 41–43]. When there is an exigency in increasing the number of available entangled pairs rather than the purity of it, it becomes important to broadcast the amount of entanglement from a given pair to different pairs. One possible way to achieve this is by applying local and non local cloing. In general cloning in this context includes both state dependent and state independent cloning [41, 44]. In a recent work we have shown that it is impossible to optimally broadcast quantum correlation across different laboratories [45]. But if we consider non optimal broadcasting it is indeed possible to broadcast quantum correlation between separated parties [46]. Other than application of cloning there are different ways to broadcast quantum correlation. Quite recently, many authors showed by using sophisticated methods that correlations in a single bipartite state can be locally or uni locally broadcast if and only if the states are classical (i.e. having classical correlation) or classical-quantum respectively [47–52].

In this work our basic objective is to broadcast QCh present in a pair of qubits to other pairs. Keeping in mind the usefulness of QCh in resource theories it is also important to broadcast it to more pair of qubits. Here we have considered the l_1 norm as a measure of coherence. Given a state ρ, with its matrix elements as ρ_{ij} the amount of coherence present in the state ρ in the basis $\{|i\rangle\}$ is given by the quantity $C(\rho) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} |\langle i|\rho|j\rangle|$, where $i \neq j$. It is interesting note that coherence is a basis dependent quantity as the representation of coherence will be different in different basis. More precisely since all these measures are functions of off diagonal elements of a given density matrix representation. The value of the coherence in the eigen basis where there are no off diagonal elements, will be zero. It is intuitive that for all other basis the physical findings followed by implications will be similar. So, without any loss of generality here we have computed the coherence in the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$.

OPTIMAL AND NON OPTIMAL BROADCASTING OF COHERENCE

Let us begin with a situation where we have two distant parties A and B and they share a two qubit mixed state ρ_{12} which can be canonically expressed as,

$$\rho_{12} = \frac{1}{4}\Bigg[I_{2\times2}\otimes I_{2\times2} + \sum_{i=1}^{3}(x_i\sigma_i\otimes I) + \sum_{i=1}^{3}(y_i I\otimes\sigma_i) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{3}(t_{ij}\sigma_i\otimes\sigma_j)\Bigg] = \Big\{\vec{X},\ \vec{Y},\ T_{3\times3}\Big\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\vec{X} = \{x_1,\ x_2,\ x_3\}$ and $\vec{Y} = \{y_1,\ y_2,\ y_3\}$ are Bloch vectors with $0 \leq \|\vec{x}\| \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \|\vec{y}\| \leq 1$. Here, t_{ij}'s $(i,\ j = \{1, 2, 3\})$ are elements of the correlation matrix $(T = [t_{ij}]_{3\times3})$, whereas $\sigma_i = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ are the Pauli matrices and I is the identity matrix.



FIG. 1: The first figure, on the left, shows the broadcasting of the input state ρ_{12} into $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$ through application of local cloning unitary operations U_1 and U_2 on both sides; while, the second figure, on the right, shows the broadcasting of the input state ρ_{12} into $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{34}$ through the application of U_{12} on the input state.

We start with two qubit state ρ_{12} and then apply univer-

sal symmetric optimal Buzek Hillery cloner both locally and non locally (U^l_{bh}/U^{nl}_{bh}) as a cloning transformation. In short, broadcasting will be possible if we are able to produce more coherent pairs out of initial coherent pair. In principle, broadcasting is both optimal and non optimal and depends upon the choice of cloning machine.

We separately investigate both *Optimal* and *Non Optimal Broadcasting*. In principle, in order to broadcast the amount of coherence between the desired pairs $(1,4)/(1,2)$ and $(2,3)/(3,4)$ (see Fig 1), we need to maximize the amount of coherence between the non-local output pairs, regardless of the states between $(1,3)$ and $(2,4)$. However, for optimal broadcasting of coherence across parties, we need to minimize the amount of coherence within parties, i.e, in the states $(1,3)$ and $(2,4)$.This is because the total amount of coherence (C) produced after cloning operation is equal to the sum of the coherence within parties (C_l) and the coherence across the parties (C_{nl}), i.e $C = C_l + C_{nl}$. To maximize C_{nl}, we must have $C_l = 0$. In other words, for optimal broadcasting we should have no coherence between the qubits $(1,3)$ and $(2,4)$.

Definition: Optimal Broadcasting (Local/Nonlocal) We start with two parties A and B sharing a coherent input state ρ_{12}, with qubits 1 and 2 on A's side and B's side respectively. A coherent input state ρ_{12} is said to be broadcast optimally after the application of local cloning operation $U_1 \otimes U_2$, on the qubits 1 and 2 respectively, if for some values of the input state parameters, the non-local output states, given by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_{14} &= Tr_{23}\left[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}\right] = Tr_{23}\left[U_1 \otimes U_2\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right], \\ \tilde{\rho}_{23} &= Tr_{14}\left[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}\right] = Tr_{14}\left[U_1 \otimes U_2\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

of A and B are coherent i.e $C(\tilde{\rho}_{14}) \neq 0, C(\tilde{\rho}_{23}) \neq 0$, while the local output states, given by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_{13} &= Tr_{24}\left[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}\right] = Tr_{24}\left[U_1 \otimes U_2\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right], \\ \tilde{\rho}_{24} &= Tr_{13}\left[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}\right] = Tr_{13}\left[U_1 \otimes U_2\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right], \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

of A and B are incoherent i.e $C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 0, C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = 0$. Similarly, a coherent input state ρ_{12} is said to be broadcast optimally after the application of non local cloning operation U_{12} together on qubits 1 and 2, if for some values of the input state parameters, the non-local output states, given by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_{12} &= Tr_{34}\left[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}\right] = Tr_{34}\left[U_{12}\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right], \\ \tilde{\rho}_{34} &= Tr_{12}\left[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}\right] = Tr_{12}\left[U_{12}\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

of A and B are coherent i.e $C(\tilde{\rho}_{12}) \neq 0, C(\tilde{\rho}_{34}) \neq 0$, while the local output states, given by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_{13} &= Tr_{24}\left[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}\right] = Tr_{24}\left[U_{12}\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right], \\ \tilde{\rho}_{24} &= Tr_{13}\left[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}\right] = Tr_{13}\left[U_{12}\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

of A and B are incoherent i.e $C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 0, C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = 0$. Here, in this work, we show that it is impossible to broadcast coherence optimally in both the cases of local and non local cloning. We show this for the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ starting with most general mixed state (given in Eq. (1)) as a resource with the help of the following theorems.

Theorem 1. *Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12} (given by Eq. (1)) and B-H local cloning transformations (U^l_{bh} (see Appendix B)), it is impossible to optimally broadcast the coherence within ρ_{12} into two lesser coherent states: [(a)] $\tilde{\rho}_{14} = Tr_{23}\left[U_1 \otimes U_2\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right]$, [(b)] $\tilde{\rho}_{23} = Tr_{14}\left[U_1 \otimes U_2\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right]$ (Here we have $U_1(U_2) \equiv U^l_{bh}(U^l_{bh})$) in the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$.*

Proof. Here, we consider the input state as the most general two qubit mixed state ρ_{12} (given by Eq. (1)). The B-H local cloning transformation U^l_{bh} is applied to clone qubits ($1 \to 3$ and $2 \to 4$) of ρ_{12}. We have local output states as, $\tilde{\rho}_{13} = \{\mu x, \mu x, T_l\}, \tilde{\rho}_{24} = \{\mu y, \mu y, T_l\}$, where $T_l = diag(2\lambda, 2\lambda, 1-4\lambda)$ and the non local output states $\tilde{\rho}_{14} = \tilde{\rho}_{23} = \{\mu x, \mu y, \mu^2 T\}$. Here, $\mu = 1 - 2\lambda$ with μ and λ being the cloning machine parameters and x, y represent the Bloch vector and T represents the correlation matrix of the input state. The coherence calculated by using l_1 norm of the local output states in the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ are given by, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 2\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} + 2\lambda(1 - 2\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}) > 0$ on A's side and $C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = 2\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2} + 2\lambda(1 - 2\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2}) > 0$ on B's side. Each of these quantities are positive as the norm $||x||, ||y||$ are positive quantities lying between 0 and 1. This is true for all values of λ lying between $(0, 1/2)$. Since the coherence of local output states are non vanishing, it is clear enough that it is impossible to optimally brodcast quantum coherence.

Now for $\lambda = 1/6$, the above B-H local cloner U^l_{bh} reduces to state independent B-H optimal local cloner. Subsequently, the coherence of local output states changes to, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 1/3 + (4/3)\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}) > 0$ and $C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = 1/3 + (4/3)\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2}) > 0$.

□

Theorem 2. *Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12} (given by Eq. (1)) and B-H non-local cloning transformations (U^{nl}_{bh} (see Appendix B)), it is impossible to optimally broadcast the coherence within ρ_{12} into two lesser coherent states: [(a)] $\tilde{\rho}_{12} = Tr_{34}\left[U_{12}\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right]$, [(b)] $\tilde{\rho}_{34} = Tr_{12}\left[U_{12}\left(\rho_{12}\right)\right]$. (Here we have $U_{12} \equiv U^{nl}_{bh}$) in the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$.*

Proof. Similar to the previous proof, here also we start with most general version of the two qubit mixed state ρ_{12} (given by Eq. (1)). When B-H non-local cloning transformation U^{nl}_{bh} is applied non locally to clone qubits

$(1 \to 3$ and $2 \to 4)$ of ρ_{12}, then, we have local output states as, $\tilde{\rho}_{13} = \{\mu x, \mu x, T_{nl}\}, \tilde{\rho}_{24} = \{\mu y, \mu y, T_{nl}\}$, where $T_{nl} = diag(2\lambda, 2\lambda, 1-8\lambda)$ and the non local output states $\tilde{\rho}_{12} = \tilde{\rho}_{34} = \{\mu x, \mu y, \mu T\}$. Here, $\mu = 1-4\lambda$ with μ and λ being the cloning machine parameters and x, y represent the Bloch vector and T represents the correlation matrix of the input state. The coherence calculated by using l_1 norm measure in the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. Hence, for the local output states, we have, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 2\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} + 2\lambda(1 - 4\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}) > 0$ on A's side and $C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = 2\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2} + 2\lambda(1 - 4\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2}) > 0$ on B's side. Each of these quantities are positive as the norm $||x||, ||y||$ are positive quantities lying between 0 and 1. This is true for all values of λ lying between $(0, 1/4)$. Similarly here also we see that it is impossible to broadcast quantum coherence optimally as we have non vanishing quantum coherence for local output states.

Now for $\lambda = 1/10$, the above B-H non-local cloning machine U_{bh}^{nl} reduces to state independent B-H optimal non-local cloner. Subsequently, the coherence of local output states changes to, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 1/5 + (6/5)\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}) > 0$ and $C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = 1/5 + (6/5)\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2}) > 0$.

□

At this point it is interesting to note that though it is impossible to broadcast optimally QCh between the desired qubits. However, it does not rule out the entire possibility of broadcasting. If we relax the condition $C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 0, C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = 0$, then we show that subsequently it will be possible to broadcast QCh. We show this for the most general two qubit mixed state as a resource.

Definition : Non Optimal Broadcasting (Local/Non local) A coherent state ρ_{12} is said to be broadcast non optimally after the application of local cloning operation $U_1 \otimes U_2$, on the qubits 1 and 2 respectively or by non local cloning operation U_{12} together on qubits 1 and 2, if for some values of the input state parameters, the coherence of non-local output states are greater than coherence of local output states , i.e, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{14}) \geq \{C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}, C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}))\}$ and $C(\tilde{\rho}_{23}) \geq \{C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}, C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}))\}$ in the local cloning case ; and, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{12}) \geq \{C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}, C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}))\}$ and $C(\tilde{\rho}_{34}) \geq \{C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}, C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}))\}$ in the non-local cloning case.

Under this relaxation, the quantum coherence of the cloned state $\tilde{\rho}_{14}, \tilde{\rho}_{23}$ can either increase, or remain same or even decrease from the initial resource state ρ_{12}, which implies the following three scenarios after broadcasting :

- $[C(\tilde{\rho}_{12}), C(\tilde{\rho}_{34})]$, $[C(\tilde{\rho}_{14}), C(\tilde{\rho}_{23})] < C(\rho_{12})$
- $[C(\tilde{\rho}_{12}), C(\tilde{\rho}_{34})]$, $[C(\tilde{\rho}_{14}), C(\tilde{\rho}_{23})] = C(\rho_{12})$
- $[C(\tilde{\rho}_{12}), C(\tilde{\rho}_{34})]$, $[C(\tilde{\rho}_{14}), C(\tilde{\rho}_{23})] > C(\rho_{12})$

Interestingly, in this work we show that it is indeed impossible to increase the quantum coherence by local and non local cloning operation though in general it is possible to increase the quantum coherence by local operations. We present this result in form of two following theorems, where we have considered general local and non local cloning transformations.

Theorem 3. *Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12} (given by Eq. (1)) and B-H local cloning transformations (U_{bh}^l), we can always create two states $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{32}$, such that : (a) $C(\tilde{\rho}_{14}) < C(\rho_{12})$ (b) $C(\tilde{\rho}_{32}) < C(\rho_{12})$ in the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$.*

Proof. We start with most general representation of two qubit mixed state ρ_{12} (given by Eq. (1)). When Buzek Hillary local cloning transformation U_{bh}^l is applied to ρ_{12}, we get the non local output states as $\tilde{\rho}_{14} = \tilde{\rho}_{23} = \{\mu x, \mu y, \mu^2 T\}$. Here, $\mu = 1 - 2\lambda$ with μ and λ being the cloning machine parameters and x, y represent the Bloch vector and T represents the correlation matrix of the input state. Using l_1-norm as measure of coherence we find out the coherence in the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$, $C(\rho_{12}) = 1/2[a_1 + a_2 + a_3]$ and $C(\tilde{\rho}_{14}(\tilde{\rho}_{23})) = 1/2[b_1 + b_2 + b_3]$.
where,

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1 &= \sqrt{(T_{13} + T_{21})^2 + (T_{11} - T_{22})^2} \\
&\quad + \sqrt{(T_{12} - T_{21})^2 + (T_{11} + T_{22})^2} \\
a_2 &= \sqrt{(T_{13} - x_1)^2 + (T_{23} - x_2)^2} \\
&\quad + \sqrt{(T_{13} + x_1)^2 + (T_{23} + x_2)^2} \\
a_3 &= \sqrt{(T_{31} - y_1)^2 + (T_{32} - y_2)^2} \\
&\quad + \sqrt{(T_{31} + y_1)^2 + (T_{32} + y_2)^2} \\
b_1 &= \mu^2\sqrt{(T_{13} + T_{21})^2 + (T_{11} - T_{22})^2} \\
&\quad + \mu^2\sqrt{(T_{12} - T_{21})^2 + (T_{11} + T_{22})^2} \\
b_2 &= \mu\sqrt{(\mu T_{13} - x_1)^2 + (\mu T_{23} - x_2)^2} \\
&\quad + \mu\sqrt{(\mu T_{13} + x_1)^2 + (\mu T_{23} + x_2)^2} \\
b_3 &= \mu\sqrt{(\mu T_{31} - y_1)^2 + (\mu T_{32} - y_2)^2} \\
&\quad + \mu\sqrt{(\mu T_{31} + y_1)^2 + (\mu T_{32} + y_2)^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

If we can show that the conditions $a_1 > b_1$, $a_2 > b_2$ and $a_3 > b_3$ hold true, then we can always conclude that $C(\tilde{\rho}_{12}) > C(\tilde{\rho}_{14}(\tilde{\rho}_{23}))$.

At first, if we observe the terms a_1 and b_1 carefully, we find that $b_1 = \mu^2 a_1 < a_1$ because $\mu = 1 - 2\lambda < 1$.
Now, we need to compare a_2 and b_2.If we observe the terms in a_2 and b_2, and ignoring the constant $1/2$, they can be thought of as distance between two points in a Cartesian Plane. Let us denote the distance between two points A and B in a 2-dimensional space (like XY Cartesian Plane) by $\|AB\|$.Let

us consider $\tilde{b_2} = \sqrt{(\mu T_{13} - x_1)^2 + (\mu T_{23} - x_2)^2} + \sqrt{(\mu T_{13} + x_1)^2 + (\mu T_{23} + x_2)^2}$ and as $\mu < 1$, so, we have, $b_2 < \tilde{b_2}$. Now, assume 4 points in Cartesian Plane, namely, $A(T_{13}, T_{23})$, $B(x_1, x_2)$,$C(-x_1, -x_2)$ and $D(\mu T_{13}, \mu T_{23})$ without O as the origin. Now, as $\mu < 1$, hence, it is always true that $\|OD\| = \sqrt{(\mu T_{13})^2 + (\mu T_{23})^2} = \mu\sqrt{(T_{13})^2 + (T_{23})^2} = \mu\|OA\|$; that is, $\|OD\| < \|OA\|$. So, D always lies on $\overline{OA}$, inside ΔABC. Now, from the Figure 2, we have,



FIG. 2: ΔABC in XY-Plane, with point D in its interior

$\tilde{b_2} = \|DC\| + \|DB\|$ and $a_2 = \|AC\| + \|AB\|$. Now, we have proved $\tilde{b_2} < a_2$ in the Appendix A by plane geometry.

Hence,we have,$b_2 < \tilde{b_2} < a_2$. Similarly, we can show $b_3 < a_3$. Hence, we have proved that $b_1 + b_2 + b_3 < a_1 + a_2 + a_3$. □

Theorem 4. *Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12} and B-H non local cloning transformations (U_{bh}^{nl}), we can always create two states $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{34}$, such that :(a) $C(\tilde{\rho}_{12}) = \mu C(\rho_{12}) < C(\rho_{12})$ (b) $C(\tilde{\rho}_{34}) = \mu C(\rho_{12}) < C(\rho_{12})$ in the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$, where $\mu = 1 - 4\lambda$, is the machine parameter.*

Proof. First of all we apply Buzek Hillary non-local cloning transformation U_{bh}^{nl} to the 2- qubit general mixed quantum states ρ_{12} (Eq. (1)). The non local output states obtained as aresult of this are given by, $\tilde{\rho}_{12} = \tilde{\rho}_{34} = \{\mu x, \mu y, \mu T\}$. Here, $\mu = 1 - 4\lambda$ with μ and λ being the cloning machine parameters, x, y represent the Bloch vector and T represents the correlation matrix of the input state. The QCh present in these states are calculated in the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ by using the l_1 norm are given by, $C(\rho_{12}) = \frac{1}{2}X$ and $C(\tilde{\rho}_{12}(\tilde{\rho}_{34})) = \mu/2X$. where,

$$\begin{aligned} X = & [\sqrt{(T_{13} + T_{21})^2 + (T_{11} - T_{22})^2} \\ & + \sqrt{(T_{12} - T_{21})^2 + (T_{11} + T_{22})^2} \\ & + \sqrt{(T_{13} - x_1)^2 + (T_{23} - x_2)^2} \\ & + \sqrt{(T_{13} + x_1)^2 + (T_{23} + x_2)^2} \\ & + \sqrt{(T_{31} - y_1)^2 + (T_{32} - y_2)^2} \\ & + \sqrt{(T_{31} + y_1)^2 + (T_{32} + y_2)^2}] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Now, we know, $\mu = 1 - 4\lambda < 1$ and $\lambda < 1/4$. So, clearly, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{12}) = \mu C(\rho_{12}) < C(\rho_{12})$ and $C(\tilde{\rho}_{34}) = \mu C(\rho_{12}) < C(\rho_{12})$. Hence, we have created two 'weaker' (in terms of coherence) correlations from input correlation after non-local cloning. □

NON OPTIMAL BROADCASTING FOR PARTICULAR MIXED STATES

In this section, we consider the standard examples of two qubit mixed state as a resource state. These include Werner like states (WLS) and Bell diagonal states (BDS). We apply the standard BH cloner both locally and non locally, to find the range where at least non optimal broadcasting is possible, in terms of input state parameters. In both the examples, we have chosen computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ for measuring coherence via l_1-norm.

Example: A. Werner Like States (WLS):

As our first example, we consider Werner-like states (WLS), which can be formally expressed in terms of Bloch vectors as, $\rho_{12}^w = \{\vec{x}^w, \vec{x}^w, T^w\}$, where $\vec{x}^w = \{0,\ 0,\ p\left(\alpha^2 - \beta^2\right)\}$ is the Bloch vector and the correlation matrix is given by, $T^w = \begin{pmatrix} 2p\alpha\beta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2p\alpha\beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & p \end{pmatrix}$ with the condition $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$ and $0 \leq p \leq 1$.

Local Cloning

The local output states obtained after applying general local cloning operation (U_{bh}^l) on both the qubits 1 and 2 are given by, $\tilde{\rho}_{13} = \tilde{\rho}_{24} = \{\mu\vec{x}^w,\ \mu\vec{x}^w,\ T_l\}$, where $\vec{x}^w$ is the Bloch vector of the state ρ_{12}^w, $T_l = diag[2\lambda, 2\lambda, 1-4\lambda]$ and $\mu = 1 - 2\lambda$, where μ and λ being the machine state parameter (see Appendix B). Also, we have the non-local output states as, $\tilde{\rho}_{14} = \tilde{\rho}_{23} = \left\{\mu\vec{x}^w,\ \mu\vec{x}^w,\ \mu^2 T^w\right\}$, where $\vec{x}^w$ is Bloch vector, T^w is the correlation matrix of the state ρ_{12}^w.

Now, coherence for the local output state is independent of p and α and it is given by, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = 2\lambda$. On the other hand, coherence of non-local output state depends on p, α, λ and it is given by,

$C(\tilde{\rho}_{14}) = C(\tilde{\rho}_{23}) = 2p(1-2\lambda)^2\sqrt{(1-\alpha^2)\alpha^2}$. For non optimal broadcasting of coherence, our region of interest is the one where the condition $C(\tilde{\rho}_{14}) > C(\tilde{\rho}_{13})$ or $C(\tilde{\rho}_{23}) > C(\tilde{\rho}_{24})$ is satisfied. This condition eventually reduces to $\sqrt{(1-\alpha^2)\alpha^2}p > \frac{\lambda}{(1-2\lambda)^2}$ for general local cloning case.

In order to obtain the state independent local cloner, we substitute the value of λ as 1/6. The corresponding values of coherence of the local output states, if we perform state independent cloning, are given by, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = \frac{1}{3}$ and the coherence of non-local output state is given by, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{14}) = C(\tilde{\rho}_{23}) = \frac{8}{9}\sqrt{(1-\alpha^2)\alpha^2}p$. Subsequently, the condition under which non optimal broadcasting would be possible reduces to $\frac{8}{3}\sqrt{(1-\alpha^2)\alpha^2} > \frac{1}{p}$.

p	α^2
0.65	Not possible
0.70	Not possible
0.75	Not possible
0.80	$0.326 < \alpha^2 < 0.674$
0.85	$0.265 < \alpha^2 < 0.735$
0.90	$0.224 < \alpha^2 < 0.776$
0.95	$0.193 < \alpha^2 < 0.807$

TABLE I: Broadcasting ranges for local state independent cloning in case of Werner Like states.

In Table I, we summarize the broadcasting ranges obtained for state independent local cloning in terms of the parameter α^2 for fixed set of values of the classical mixing parameter p. It is evident from the table that in case of local state independent cloning, we can broadcast coherence only for a very small interval of p.

Non-local Cloning

Next, we use general non-local cloning machine (U_{bh}^{nl}) to obtain the local output states as, $\tilde{\rho}_{13} = \tilde{\rho}_{24} = \left\{\mu\vec{x^w}, \mu\vec{x^w}, T_{nl}\right\}$ and the non-local output states as, $\tilde{\rho}_{12} = \tilde{\rho}_{34} = \left\{\mu\vec{x^w}, \mu\vec{x^w}, \mu T^w\right\}$. Now, we have $\mu = 1-4\lambda$, λ being the machine parameter and T^w is same as input state correlation matrix. Here, x^w is the input state bloch vector for werner like state and $T_{nl} = diag[2\lambda, 2\lambda, 1-8\lambda]$.

Thereafter, we calculate the coherence for the local output states and find it as ,$C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = 2\lambda$, which is independent of p and α.The coherence of non-local output state depends on p, α, λ and it is given by, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{12}) = C(\tilde{\rho}_{34}) = 2\sqrt{(1-\alpha^2)\alpha^2}p(1-4\lambda)$. The expression for the condition of broadcasting in the general non-local cloning case reduces to $\sqrt{(1-\alpha^2)\alpha^2}p > \frac{\lambda}{(1-4\lambda)}$.

To obtain the state independent version, we substitute the value of λ as 1/10. The corresponding coherence function after state independent non-local cloning is given by $C(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = C(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = \frac{1}{5}$. The coherence of non-local output state depends on p, α, λ and it is given by, $C(\tilde{\rho}_{12}) = C(\tilde{\rho}_{34}) = \frac{6}{5}\sqrt{(1-\alpha^2)\alpha^2}p$. The condition for broadcasting in state independent case is given by $\sqrt{(1-\alpha^2)\alpha^2} > \frac{1}{6p}$.

p	α^2
0.35	$0.348 < \alpha^2 < 0.652$
0.45	$0.164 < \alpha^2 < 0.836$
0.50	$0.127 < \alpha^2 < 0.873$
0.60	$0.084 < \alpha^2 < 0.916$
0.70	$0.060 < \alpha^2 < 0.939$
0.80	$0.045 < \alpha^2 < 0.955$
0.90	$0.036 < \alpha^2 < 0.964$

TABLE II: Broadcasting ranges for non-local state-independent cloning in case of Werner Like states.

In Table II, we summarize the broadcasting ranges obtained for state independent non-local cloning in terms of the parameter α^2 for fixed set of values of the classical mixing parameter p. It is evident from the table that in case of non-local state independent cloning, we can broadcast coherence only for a much larger interval of p, thereby, significantly outperforming the state independent local cloner.



FIG. 3: In this figure, we show Werner-Like states, represented by parameters α^2 and p which can be broadcast after applying the two types of cloning transformations.

The figure 3 shows the regions of broadcasting when various cloners are used. The innermost dark-blue coloured region, enclosed by a small arc, shows the broadcasting zone when local state-independent cloning machine is

used. On the other hand, the outermost light-blue coloured region, enclosed by the large arc,shows the broadcasting zone when state independent non-local cloner is used. It is evident from this plot that non-local state independent cloning performs considerably better compared to its local counterpart. This observation has also been earlier noted from the tables of broadcasting ranges.

Example: B. Bell Diagonal States (BDS):

A Bell diagonal state is a 2-qubit state that is diagonal in the Bell basis. In other words, it is a mixture of the four Bell states. It can be written as $\rho_{12} = p_1|\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+| + p_2|\Psi^+\rangle\langle\Psi^+| + p_3|\Phi^-\rangle\langle\Phi^-| + p_4|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|$, where $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 = 1$. A Bell-diagonal state is separable if all the probabilities are less or equal to 1/2. After transforming ρ_{12} from Bell-basis to computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$, we convert the 4-parameter description to a 3-parameter description via β coordinate transformation. In the Beta coordinate system, the set of Bell-diagonal states can be visualized as a tetrahedron where the four Bell states are the corners. The following change of coordinate system makes the plotting of states easy, which is given by : $\beta_0 = \frac{1}{2}(p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4)$, $\beta_1 = \frac{1}{2}(p_1 - p_2 - p_3 + p_4)$ $\beta_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(p_1 - p_4)$, $\beta_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(p_2 - p_3)$.

The coordinate β_0 will always be equal to 1/2, and (β_1 , β_2 , β_3) can be plotted in 3D easily. In β-coordinate system, Bell Diagonal states are mathematically described as , $\rho_{12} = \{\vec{0}, \vec{0}, T^b\}$, where $\vec{0}$ is the null vector and $T^b = diag[\sqrt{2}(\beta_2 - \beta_3), -2\beta_1, \sqrt{2}(\beta_2 + \beta_3)]$ is the correlation matrix .The β-coordinate system has the advantage that two of the edges are parallel to axes of the coordinate-system.

Local Cloning

When we apply the general local cloning machine (U^l_{bh}), the local output states are given by,$\rho^{out}_{13} = \rho^{out}_{24} = \{\vec{0}, \vec{0}, T_l\}$ and the non local output states are $\rho_{14} = \rho_{23} = \{\vec{0}, \vec{0}, \mu^2 T^b\}$, where $\mu = 1 - 2\lambda$ with μ and λ being the machine parameters, T_l is same as in case of werner like state and T^b is the input state correlation matrix for Bell diagonal state, as described earlier.

In case of general local cloner, the coherence of local output states is given by, $C(\rho_{13}) = C(\rho_{24}) = 2\lambda$, while, on the other hand, the coherence of non-local output states is given by, $C(\rho_{14}) = C(\rho_{23}) = \frac{|(2\beta_2 - \beta_3)(1-2\lambda)^2|}{\sqrt{2}}$. Now, in order to obtain the state independent version of the local cloner, we substitute $\lambda = 1/6$. Hence, after substituting $\lambda = 1/6$ for the state independent case, we have $C(\rho_{13}) = C(\rho_{24}) = \frac{1}{3}$ and $C(\rho_{14}) = C(\rho_{23}) = \frac{4|2\beta_2 - \beta_3|}{9\sqrt{2}}$.The expression for the condition of broadcasting in this case is $4|2\beta_2 - \beta_3| > 3\sqrt{2}$.

β_1	β_3	β_2
0.15	-0.2	$0.430 < \beta_2 \leq 0.460$
0.15	-0.15	$0.455 < \beta_2 \leq 0.460$
0.2	0.2	$-0.495 \leq \beta_2 < -0.430$
0.2	0.15	$-0.495 \leq \beta_2 < -0.455$
0.2	0.1	$-0.495 \leq \beta_2 < -0.480$
0.2	-0.1	$0.480 < \beta_2 \leq 0.495$
0.2	-0.2	$0.430 < \beta_2 \leq 0.495$
0.3	0.05	$-0.566 \leq \beta_2 < -0.505$ and $0.555 < \beta_2 \leq 0.566$
0.3	0.1	$-0.566 \leq \beta_2 < -0.480$
0.3	-0.1	$0.48033 < \beta_2 \leq 0.566$
0.4	0.05	$-0.636 \leq \beta_2 < -0.505$ and $0.555 < \beta_2 \leq 0.636$

TABLE III: Broadcasting ranges for local state-independent cloning in case of Bell-diagonal states.The Hue Index represents the trend in Hue with respect to values of non-local coherence($C(\rho_{14})$ or $C(\rho_{23})$) after normalised in a scale of 0 to 1.

In Table III, we have listed the broadcasting range for local cloning in terms of β_1, β_2 and β_3.We fix the values of β_1 and β_3 and substitute their respective values in the expression : $4|2\beta_2 - \beta_3| > 3\sqrt{2}$ in order to arrive at the desired range of values in terms of β_2. However, for certain values of β_1 and β_3, we observe discontinuities in the intervals corresponding to range of β_2, which suggest the presence of a no-broadcast zone sandwiched in between.



FIG. 4: Broadcasting of coherence in Bell-diagonal states via local state independent cloning.The Hue Index represents the trend in Hue with respect to value of non-local coherence($C(\rho_{14})$ or $C(\rho_{23})$) after normalised in a scale of 0 to 1.

In Figure 4, we have superimposed the region of broadcasting on the tetrahedral-region hosting all Bell-diagonal states in β-coordinate system, with axes β_1, β_2 and β_3.The light blue region represents the no-broadcast zone, while the two regions on the dark blue - magenta spectrum, along the edges of the two corners of the tetrahedron, highlight the regions where broadcasting of coherence is possible. In these two regions along the edges, the change in hue signifies how the values of the non-local coherence, $C(\rho_{14})$ or $C(\rho_{23})$, changes with respect to the values of the β-parameters. As the value of $C(\rho_{14}) or C(\rho_{23})$ increases, the hue changes from blue to magenta. From the figure, it is evident that in terms of coverage of the tetrahedron's volume, the zone of broadcasting is very small when compared to the no-broadcast region, thereby implying that we can broadcast coherence only in a limited set of Bell-diagonal states via local state independent cloning.

Non-local Cloning

Next, we use general non-local cloner (U_{bh}^{nl}) for cloning Bell diagonal state. The output states in this case are given by,$\rho_{13} = \rho_{24} = \{\vec{0}, \vec{0}, T_{nl}\}$, and $\rho_{12} = \rho_{34} = \{\vec{0}, \vec{0}, \mu T^b\}$, where $\mu = 1 - 4\lambda$ with μ and λ being the machine parameters, T_{nl} is same as in case of Werner like states and T^b is the input state correlation matrix for bell diagonal state, as described earlier.

The coherence of local output states is given by, $C(\rho_{13}) = C(\rho_{24}) = 2\lambda$, while, on the other hand, the coherence of non-local output states is given by, $C(\rho_{12}) = C(\rho_{34}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|(2\beta_2 - \beta_3)(-1+4\lambda)| + |\beta_3 - 4\beta_3\lambda|]$. To obtain the state independent version of the cloner, we substitute the value of λ by 1/10. Now, after substituting $\lambda = 1/10$ for the state independent case, we have, $C(\rho_{13}) = C(\rho_{24}) = \frac{1}{5}$, $C(\rho_{12}) = C(\rho_{34}) = \frac{3}{5\sqrt{2}}[|(\beta_3 - 2\beta_2)| + |\beta_3|]$. In this case, the expression for the condition of broadcasting reduces to, $3\sqrt{2}[|(\beta_3 - 2\beta_2)| + |\beta_3|] > 1$.

In Table IV, we have shown some of the trends in broadcasting ranges obtained in terms of β_1, β_2 and β_3 after state independent non-local cloning transformations. We fix the values of β_1 and β_3 and substitute their respective values in the expression $3\sqrt{2}[|(\beta_3 - 2\beta_2)| + |\beta_3|] > 1$. Here, from $\beta_1 = -0.1$ onwards, discontinuities in the intervals corresponding to the ranges of β_2-parameter are observed, which imply the presence of a no-broadcast zone in between.

In Figure 5, the region of broadcasting is superimposed on the tetrahedral-region hosting all Bell-diagonal states in β-coordinate system, with axes β_1, β_2 and β_3.The light light regions represent the no-broadcast zones,

β_1	β_3	β_2
-0.2	-0.2	$0.036 < \beta_2 \leq 0.212$
-0.2	-0.1	$0.136 < \beta_2 \leq 0.212$
-0.2	0.1	$-0.212 \leq \beta_2 < -0.136$
-0.2	0.2	$-0.212 \leq \beta_2 < -0.036$
-0.1	-0.2	$-0.283 \leq \beta_2 < -0.236$ and $0.036 < \beta_2 \leq 0.283$
-0.1	-0.1	$-0.283 \leq \beta_2 < -0.236$ and $0.136 < \beta_2 \leq 0.283$
-0.1	0.1	$-0.283 \leq \beta_2 < -0.136$ and $0.236 < \beta_2 \leq 0.283$
-0.1	0.2	$-0.283 \leq \beta_2 < -0.036$ and $0.236 < \beta_2 \leq 0.283$
0.1	-0.2	$-0.424 \leq \beta_2 < -0.236$ and $0.036 < \beta_2 \leq 0.424$
0.1	-0.1	$-0.424 \leq \beta_2 < -0.236$ and $0.136 < \beta_2 \leq 0.424$
0.1	0.1	$-0.424 \leq \beta_2 < -0.136$ and $0.236 < \beta_2 \leq 0.424$
0.1	0.2	$-0.424 \leq \beta_2 < -0.036$ and $0.236 < \beta_2 \leq 0.424$
0.2	-0.2	$-0.495 \leq \beta_2 < -0.236$ or $0.036 < \beta_2 \leq 0.495$
0.2	-0.1	$-0.495 \leq \beta_2 < -0.236$ or $0.136 < \beta_2 \leq 0.495$
0.2	0.1	$-0.495 \leq \beta_2 < -0.136$ or $0.236 < \beta_2 \leq 0.495$
0.2	0.2	$-0.495 \leq \beta_2 < -0.036$ or $0.236 < \beta_2 \leq 0.495$

TABLE IV: Broadcasting ranges for state-independent non-local cloning in case of Bell-diagonal states.

while the regions on the dark blue - magenta spectrum, occupying a significant fraction of the tetrahedron's volume, highlight the regions where we can broadcast coherence. In the bluish-magenta region, the change in hue signifies how the values of the non-local coherence, $C(\rho_{14})$ or $C(\rho_{23})$, changes with respect to the values of the β-parameters. As the value of $C(\rho_{14})$ or $C(\rho_{23})$ increases, the hue changes from blue to magenta. For instance, the concentrated presence of magenta-pink hue, especially in the regions along the tetrahedron's edge and in the regions surrounding the corners, suggests that non-local coherence is much higher in those regions, compared to the other regions in the broadcasting zone. Also, we find that there is a light purple cavity-like zone sandwiched in between the bluish-magenta regions, which points to a no-broadcast zone. This cavity-like zone accounts for discontinuities int the intervals corresponding to ranges of β_2-paramter in Table IV. Moreover, we observe in the figure that in terms of coverage of the tetrahedron's volume, the zone of broadcasting in the non-local cloning scenario is significantly larger when compared to that of the



FIG. 5: Broadcasting ranges for non-local state-independent cloning in case of Bell-diagonal states.The Hue Index represents the trend in Hue with respect to value of non-local coherence($C(\rho_{14})$ or $C(\rho_{23})$) after normalised in a scale of 0 to 1.

local cloning scenario (Figure 4), thereby suggesting that non-local state independent cloning performs much better when it comes to broadcasting of coherence in the bell-diagonal states.

Acknowledgements: Authors acknowledge Mr. Tushant Jha and Mr. Sourav Chatterjee for their suggestions.

[1] M.Horodecki, J. Openheim, Nat. Commun **4** 2059 (2013); C. A. Rodriguez-Rosario *et. al*, arXiv: 1308.1245; M. Lostaglio *et. al*, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 0210001 (2015); L. A. Correa *et. al* Scientific Reports **4, 3949** (2014); P. Skrzypczyk, A. J. Short, and S. Popescu, Nature Communications **5, 4185** (2014); M. Lostaglio, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Nat. Commun. **6, 6383** (2015); M. Lostaglio, K. Korzekwa, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 021001 (2015); K. Korzekwa, M. Lostaglio, J. Oppenheim, and D. Jennings,New J. Phys. 18, 023045 (2016); P. Kammerlander and J. Anders, Scientific Reports **6, 22174** (2016); G. Vacanti, C. Elouard, and A. Auffeves, (2015), arXiv:1503.01974; A. L. Malvezzi, G. Karpat, B. akmak, F. F. Fanchini, T. Debarba, and R. O. Vianna, Phys. Rev. B 93, 184428 (2016); S. Bhattacharya, S. Banerjee, and A.K. Pati, (2016), arXiv:1601.04742; Y. Yang and G. Chiribella, (2015), arXiv:1502.00259v2.

[2] S. Llyod, J phys: Conf. Ser. **302**, 012037 (2011); S. Huelga, M. Plenio,Contemp. Phys., **54**, 181 (2013); F. Levi, F. Mintert, New. J. Phys, **16**, 033007 (2014); C.M. Li, N. Lambert, Y.N. Chen, G.Y. Chen, and F. Nori, Sci. Rep. **2, 885** (2012); V. Singh Poonia, D. Saha, and S. Ganguly, (2014), arXiv:1408.1327.

[3] E. Chitambar, A. Streltsov, S. Rana, M. N. Bera, G. Adesso, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 070402 (2016); A. Winter and D. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 120404 (2016); I. Marvian and R.W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 062110,(2014); J. Aberg, (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0612146v1; G. Gour, I. Marvian, and R.W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 012307 (2009); J. Chen, J. Cui, and H. Fan, (2015), arXiv:1509.03576v1; J. Chen, N. Johnston, C.-K. Li, and S. Plosker, (2016), arXiv:1601.06269; S. Cheng and M.J.W. Hall, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 042101 (2015); P. Deb, Quantum Information Processing, **15(4)** 1629-1638(2016); S. Du, Z. Bai, and Y. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052120 (2015); M. N. Bera, T. Qureshi, M. A. Siddiqui, and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 012118 (2015); X. Liu, Z. Tian, J. Wang, and J. Jing, Annals of Physics, **366** 102-112 (2016); K. von Prillwitz, L. Rudnicki, and F. Mintert, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 052114 (2015); M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 012111 (2016); K. Bu, U. Singh, and J. Wu, (2015), Phys. Rev. A 93, 042326 (2016);. J. M. Matera, D. Egloff, N. Killoran, and M. B. Plenio, (2015), arXiv:1512.07486v1 ; Y.R. Zhang, L.-H. Shao, Y. Li, and H. Fan, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 012334 (2016); U. Singh, M. N. Bera, H. S. Dhar, and A. K. Pati,Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052115 (2015).

[4] T. Baumgratz. *et. al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140401 (2014).

[5] Davide Girolami, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 170401 (2014).

[6] X. Yuan, H. Zhou, Z. Cao, and X. Ma, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022124 (2015); D. P. Pires, L. C. Cleri, and D. O. Soares-Pinto, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 042330 (2015); B. Yadin and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 022122 (2016); S. Rana, P. Parashar, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 012110 (2016); M. Allegra, P. Giorda, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 042312 (2016);R. Chandrashekar, P. Manikandan, J. Segar, and T. Byrnes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 150504 (2016); E. Chitambar and G. Gour, Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 030401 (2016); M. Piani, M. Cianciaruso, T. R. Bromley, C. Napoli, N. Johnston, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. A 93, 042107 (2016).

[7] X. Hu, A. Milne, B. Zhang, and H. Fan, Scientific Reports 6, 19365 (2016); E. Chitambar and M.-H. Hsieh, Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 020402 (2016); A. Streltsov, S. Rana, M. Nath Bera, and M. Lewenstein,(2015), arXiv:1509.07456v2; T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 210401 (2015); A. Streltsov, U. Singh, H. S. Dhar, M. N. Bera, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 020403 (2015); Y. Yao, X. Xiao, L. Ge, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022112 (2015).

[8] Avijit Misra, Uttam Singh, Samyadeb Bhattacharya, Arun Kumar Pati, arXiv:1602.08437v2.

[9] Uttam Singh, L. Zhang, and A. K. Pati, (2015), Phys. Rev. A 93, 032125, (2016).

[10] Uttam Singh,Manabendra Nath Bera,Avijit Misra, Arun Kumar Pati, arXiv:1506.08186v1.

[11] B. Yadin, J. Ma, D. Girolami, M. Gu, and V. Vedral, (2015), arXiv:1512.02085v1.

[12] Carmine Napoli, Thomas R. Bromley, Marco Cianciaruso, Marco Piani, Nathaniel Johnston, Gerardo Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. 116, 150502 (2016).

[13] Debasis Mondal, Tanumoy Pramanik, Arun Kumar Pati, arXiv:1508.03770v2.

[14] Xiao-Dong Yu, Da-Jian Zhang, C. L. Liu, D. M. Tong, Phys. Rev. A 93, 060303(R), (2016).

[15] Jiajun Ma, Benjamin Yadin, Davide Girolami, Vlatko Vedral, Mile Gu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 116, 160407 (2016).

[16] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, Nature **299**, 802

(1982).
[17] V. Buzek and M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1844 (1996).
[18] D. Bruss, P.D. DiVincenzo, A. Ekert, C. A. Fuchs, C. Macchiavello and J. A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 2368 (1998).
[19] V. Buzek and M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5003 (1998).
[20] A. Chefles and S. M. Barnett, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 136 (1999); H. Fan, K.Matsumoto and M.Wadati, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 064301 (2001); J. Fiurasek, S. Iblisdir, S. Massar, and N. J. Cerf, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 040302 (2002); H. P.Yuen, Phys. Lett. A **113**, 405 (1986); K. Azuma, J. Shimamura, M. Koashi and N. Imoto, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 032335 (2005); S. Adhikari, N. Ganguly, I. Chakrabarty and B. S. Choudhury,J. Phys. A **41**, 415302 (2008); S Adhikari, AK Pati, I Chakrabarty, BS Choudhury, Quantum Information Processing **6** (4), 197-219.
[21] N. Gisin and S. Massar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2153 (1997).
[22] N. J. Cerf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4497 (2000).
[23] N. J. Cerf, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 187 (2000).
[24] V. Scarani, S. Iblisdir, N.Gisin and A. Acin,Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 1225 (2005), and references therein.
[25] L. M. Duan and G. C. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4999 (1998); L.Hardy and D. D. Song, Phys. Lett. A **259**, 331 (1999).
[26] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **242**, 1 (1998).
[27] S. Adhikari, I. Chakrabarty and B. S. Choudhary, J. Phys. A **39**, 8439 (2006).
[28] M. K. Shukla, I. Chakrabarty,S. Chatterjee,arXiv: 1511.05796.
[29] Sk Sazim, I. Chakrabarty, A. Datta and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev A **91**, 062311 (2015).
[30] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev., 47 777 (1935).
[31] A. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
[32] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, System and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India, pp.175-179 (1984); P. W. Shor and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 441 (2000).
[33] M. Hillery, V. Buzek and A. Berthiaume,Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1829 (1999); S. K. Sazim, I. Chakrabarty, C. Vanarasa and K. Srinathan, Quant. Inf. Process **14** 4651 (2015) ; S. Adhikari, I. Chakrabarty and P. Agrawal, Quant. Inf. Comp. **12**, 0253 (2012); M.Ray, S. Chatterjee and I. Chakrabarty, Eur. Phys. J. D **70**: 114 (2016) .
[34] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993); R. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **222**, 21 (1996).
[35] C.H.Bennett and S.J.Weisner, Phys.Rev.Lett. **69**, 2881 (1992); R. Nepal, R. Prabhu, A. Sen De and U. Sen, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 032336 (2013).
[36] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009), and references therein.
[37] S. Bose, V. Vedral and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 822 (1998); M. Zukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. A. Horne and A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 4287 (1993).
[38] Sk Sazim and I. Chakrabarty, Eur. Phys. J. D **67**, 174 (2013).
[39] D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, R. Jozsa, C. Macchiavello, S. Popescu and A. Sanpera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2818 (1996) ; L. Goldenberg and L.Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1239 (1995); A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052312 (2000); C. Li, H-S Song and L. Zhou, Journal of Optics B: Quantum semiclass. opt. **5**, 155 (2003); A. Orieux, G. Ferranti, A. D'Arrigo, R. Lo Franco, G. Benenti, E. Paladino, G. Falci, F. Sciarrino and P. Mataloni, Scientific Reports 5, 8575 (2015); A. D'Arrigo, R. Lo Franco, G. Benenti, E. Paladino and G. Falci, Ann. Phys. **350**, 211224 (2014).
[40] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2046 (1996).
[41] V. Buzek, V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, P. L. Knight and M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 3327 (1997).
[42] S. Bandyopadhyay and G. Kar, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 3296 (1999).
[43] I. Chakrabarty, Int. J. Quant. Inf, **7** (02), 559-565.
[44] S. Adhikari and B. S. Choudhury, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 032323 (2006); I. Chakrabarty and B. S. Choudhary arXiv:0804.2568.
[45] S. Chatterjee, S. Sazim, I. Chakrabarty, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 042309 (2016).
[46] A. Kheirollahi. et.al, arXiv: 1604.04995.
[47] H. Barnum, C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2818 (1996).
[48] M. Piani, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 090502 (2008).
[49] H. Barnum, J. Barrett, M. Leifer and A. Wilce, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 240501 (2007).
[50] S. Luo, Lett. Math. Phys. **92**, 143 (2010).
[51] S. Luo, N. Li and X. Cao, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 054305 (2009).
[52] I. Ghiu, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012323 (2003).

APPENDIX: SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

APPENDIX A



FIG. 6: ΔABC with point M in its interior.

Lemma 5. *Let M be a point in the interior of ΔABC. Then, $\overline{AC}+\overline{BC} > \overline{AD}+\overline{BD}$, $\overline{AB}+\overline{AC} > \overline{BD}+\overline{DC}$ and $\overline{BC}+\overline{BA} > \overline{DC}+\overline{DA}$.*

Proof. As shown in Figure 5, $\overline{AD}$ is extended to point E outside ΔABC intersecting $\overline{BC}$ at F. By applying

Triangle Inequality on ΔACF and ΔBFD, we get $\overline{AC} + \overline{CF} > \overline{AF}$ and, $\overline{DF} + \overline{BF} > \overline{BD}$ respectively.
Also, as D lies on $\overline{AF}$, we have ,$\overline{AD} + \overline{DF} = \overline{AF}$.
Now, adding these two inequalities, we have,

$$\overline{AC} + \overline{CF} + \overline{BF} + \overline{DF} > \overline{AF} + \overline{BD}$$
$$\implies \overline{AC} + (\overline{CF} + \overline{BF}) + \overline{DF} > (\overline{AD} + \overline{DF}) + \overline{BD}$$
$$\implies \overline{AC} + \overline{BC} + \overline{DF} > \overline{AD} + \overline{DF} + \overline{BD}$$

Cancelling out $\overline{DF}$, we finally get,$\overline{AC} + \overline{BC} > \overline{AD} + \overline{BD}$. Similarly, the other two inequalities can be proved. □

APPENDIX B

The cloning of arbitrary quantum states is forbidden by No-cloning theorem. However, there still exists the possibility of cloning arbitrary quantum states approximately with certain fidelity, or, 'imperfection'. Quantum cloning transformations are (CPTP) completely positive trace preserving map between two quantum systems, supported by an ancilla state. In this section, at first, we briefly describe the Buzek-Hillery (B-H) QCM.

The B-H cloning machine (U_{bh}) is a M-dimensional quantum copying transformation acting on a state $|\Psi_i\rangle_{a_0}$ (i = 1, ..., M), which is to be copied onto a blank state $|0\rangle_{a_1}$. Initially, the copy is prepared in state $|X\rangle_x$ which subsequently gets transformed into another set of state vectors $|X_{ii}\rangle_x$ and $|Y_{ij}\rangle_x$ as a result of application of the cloning machine. Here a_0, a_1 and x represent the input, blank and machine qubits respectively. In this case, these transformed state vectors belong to the orthonormal basis set in the M-dimensional space. The transformation scheme U_{bh} is given by,

$$U_{bh}\,|\Psi_i\rangle_{a_0}\,|0\rangle_{a_1}\,|X\rangle_x \rightarrow c\,|\Psi_i\rangle_{a_0}\,|\Psi_i\rangle_{a_1}\,|X_{ii}\rangle_x + d\sum_{j\neq i}^{M}\Big(|\Psi_i\rangle_{a_0}\,|\Psi_j\rangle_{a_1} + |\Psi_j\rangle_{a_0}\,|\Psi_i\rangle_{a_1}\Big)\,|Y_{ij}\rangle_x\,, \quad (8)$$

where i, $j = \{1, ..., M\}$, and the coefficients c and d are real.

State independent cloning transformations

An optimal state independent version of the B-H cloner can be obtained from Eq.(8) by imposing the unitarity and normalization conditions which give rise to the following set of constraints,
$\langle X_{ii}|X_{ii}\rangle = \langle Y_{ij}|Y_{ij}\rangle = \langle X_{ii}|Y_{ji}\rangle = 1$,
$\langle X_{ii}|Y_{ij}\rangle = \langle Y_{ji}|Y_{ij}\rangle = \langle X_{ii}|X_{jj}\rangle = 0$ and

$$c^2 = \frac{2}{M+1}, d^2 = \frac{1}{2(M+1)}. \quad (9)$$

Here, $M = 2^m$ where m is the number of qubits in a given quantum register. In this transformation,the fidelity of the output copies doesn't depend on the input state because the shrinking or scaling property is independent of the input states.

Now, by substituting $c = d = 1$, the unitarity constraints on the B-H cloning transformation in Eq. (8) give rise to the following set of conditions:

$$\langle X_{ii}|X_{ii}\rangle + \sum_{j\neq i}^{M} 2\,\langle Y_{ij}|Y_{ij}\rangle = 1,\ \langle Y_{ij}|Y_{kl}\rangle = 0, \quad (10)$$

where $i \neq j$ and $ij \neq kl$ for $i, j, k, l = \{1, ..., M\}$; and the output states are no longer necessarily orthonormal.
Let us assume that,

$$\langle X_{ii}|Y_{jk}\rangle = \frac{\mu}{2}, \quad (11)$$
$$\langle Y_{ij}|Y_{ij}\rangle = \lambda,\ \langle X_{ii}|X_{jj}\rangle = \langle X_{ii}|Y_{ij}\rangle = 0, \quad (12)$$

where again $i \neq j$ for $i, j, k = \{1, ..., M\}$; μ and λ are the machine parameters.

Local state independent cloning machine

The optimal cloning machine described above with $M = 2$ becomes a local cloning machine (U^l_{bhsi}). By substituting the values of the coefficients c=$\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$ and d=$\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}$ in Eq. (8), we obtain the optimal state independent cloning machine which can be used for local copying purposes.In this case, the value of λ is 1/6.

Non local state independent cloning machine

Similarly,the optimal cloning machine described above becomes a non local cloning machine (U^{nl}_{bhsi}) for $M = 4$. Then the corresponding values of the coefficients c and d in Eq.10 become $\sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}$ and $\sqrt{\frac{1}{10}}$ respectively.Now, by substituting the values of the coefficients c=$\sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}$ and d=$\sqrt{\frac{1}{10}}$ in Eq. (8), we obtain the optimal state independent non local cloning machine.In this case, the value of λ is 1/10.